## REMARKS

Claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. As previously indicated, claims 11-14 have been canceled herein.

 $\mbox{Claims} \ \ 1 \ \ \mbox{and} \ \ 2 \ \mbox{were} \ \ \mbox{rejected} \ \ \mbox{under} \ \ 35 \ \mbox{U.S.C.} \ \ 112, \\ \mbox{second paragraph} \ .$ 

Claims 1 and 2 as presented herein are believed to overcome the matters identified by the Examiner in discussing the above 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the above 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pub. No. US 2003/0012176 A1 ("Kondylis").

 $\label{eq:Amended} Amended \ \ independent \ \ claim \ \ 1 \ \ recites \ \ in \ \ part \ \ the following:$ 

"said additional receiving slot being synchronized with the beacon signal, and

said beacon signal having identifying information which identifies the radio communication apparatus which transmitted the beacon signal, length information which indicates a length of the beacon signal, and slot information which indicates a receiving slot position."

It is respectfully submitted that Kondylis as applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose the above features of claim 1. For example, although paragraph 0069 of Kondylis appears to mention a beacon as indicated by the Examiner, such portion of Kondylis does not appear to describe that an additional receiving slot is synchronized with its beacon and that its beacon has identifying information which identifies the radio communication apparatus which transmitted the beacon, length information which indicates a length of the beacon, and slot information which indicates a receiving slot position. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable over Kondylis as applied by the Examiner.

 $\label{eq:Amended} \textbf{Amended} \quad \text{independent claim 2 recites in part the following:}$ 

"said beacon signal having identifying information which identifies the radio communication apparatus which transmitted the beacon signal, length information which indicates a length of the beacon signal, and slot information which indicates a receiving slot position."

It is respectfully submitted that Kondylis as applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose the above features of claim 2 for at least the reasons previously described. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is distinguishable over Kondylis as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to independent claim 2, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 3-10 are also distinguishable from Kondylis as applied by the Examiner.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-

Application No.: 10/738,418 Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-1049

5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Dennis M. Smid, Esq..
Registration No.: 34,930
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attornev for Applicant

805479 1.DOC